

REMARKS

Favorable consideration of this Application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

After entry of the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1-4, 6, 9-11, 14-16, and 19-21 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 have been amended. Support for the amendment of Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 can be found at least at Fig. 4. No new matter has been added.

By way of summary, the Official Action presents the following issues: Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 16, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Prust (U.S. Patent No. 6,714,968) in view of Burson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,405,245, hereinafter Burson), in further view of Cohen (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,941), in further view of Applicant's Background section (hereinafter "Applicants' Background"); and, Claims 4, 9, 14, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being anticipated by Prust, Burson, Cohen, and Applicants' Background, in further view of Hayes Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,826, hereinafter Hayes).

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The outstanding Official Action has rejected Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 16, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Prust in view of Burson, in further view of Cohen, in further view of Applicant's Background. The Official Action states that Prust discloses all of the Applicants' claim limitations with the exception of providing a universal resource locator (URL) defined, in part, by user registration data. The Official Action cites the Applicants' Background section as describing this feature. Additionally, the Official Action notes that Burson and Cohen disclose receiving one or more automatic upload programs, transferring a control file used for controlling access used by another user, and the

establishment of personal storage areas. The Official Action states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the cited references for arriving at the Applicants' claims. Applicants' respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an information processing device, including:

... receiving means for receiving address data defined, in part, by the user registration data, the address designated as an access point indicating said exclusive storage area over said network and for receiving one or more automatic upload programs;

wherein each of said automatic upload programs is programmed to connect to a unique part of said exclusive storage area;

connection means for allowing each of said automatic upload programs to perform connection processing automatically to said access point in the said server via actuation of a corresponding upload icon; and

Prust describes a computing environment (200), in which client computers (205) access a storage network (220). The storage network includes individual storage areas (225), which can be assigned to different users.¹ Upon registration, the storage network allocates a specific storage area to a user. Access methods include utilizing a user interface of a local operating system of the client computer. In another embodiment, the user-designated storage area may be accessed by a web browser.²

As can be appreciated, access of the storage area in Prust is via manual operation of a web browser.³ Applicants' amended Claim 1, as well as claims depending therefrom by virtue of dependency, recite receiving address data, which is defined, in part, by the user registration data, wherein automatic upload programs perform connection processing automatically to said access point embodied by the address data via actuation of a corresponding upload icon.

¹ Prust at column 4, lines 52-63.

² Prust at column 5, lines 28-31.

³ Prust at column 5, lines 51-53; column 7, lines 3-6.

The Official Action cites the Applicants' Background section as disclosing the provision of a URL, which is address data defined, in part, by user registration data and the address designated as an access point. The portion of the Applicants' Background section cited in the Official Action merely describes:

... a uniform resource locator (URL) related to a user ID is issued, which is notified of the user thereby permitting the user, thereby permitting the user to store the data of his/her homepage in the exclusive storage area and the server meeting the URL.⁴

Nowhere in the above citation is there a disclosure, or suggestion, of including registration data in a URL address, which is used as an access point by automatic upload programs, as currently recited in Applicants' Claim 1. Simply stated, a URL "related" to a user ID simply means that upon registration, a user is issued a URL.

In response to the aforementioned distinctions, the Advisory Action of April 17, 2006 stated:

... Applicant's arguments do not address the fact that Prust taught implicitly a user ID that was part of the address data. Prust clearly discloses in his figures that the user name is defined as the name of the file directory, in figure 6, and as part of the email address in figure 7. The use of the email address to email data objects to his data to his data storage. Thus, Prust's teaching of an email address, defined in part by the user name, discloses an address data defined in part by user registration data⁵...

As noted in the Advisory Action, Prust illustrates the use of a user name to identify a directory and/or an email address. However, Applicants' claims recite that user registration data is utilized as an address for designating an access point. The access point, which is defined by the user registration data, is utilized for connecting the information processing device upon actuation of a corresponding upload icon. As can be appreciated, an email

⁴ Applicants specification at page 2.

⁵ Advisory Action of April 17, 2006 at page 2.

address is not an access point. Likewise, the file structure of Prust merely illustrates that subdirectories may be identified in accordance with any number of naming conventions.

Prust does not disclose or support defining address data to include user registration data in which the access point is subject to automatic connection processing based upon actuation of a corresponding upload icon. Likewise, as neither Burson, nor Cohen, satisfy the deficiency discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, and any claim depending therefrom, are allowable over the cited combination of references. Moreover, as independent Claims 6, 11, and 16 recite substantially similar limitations to that discussed above, these claims and any corresponding dependent claims are likewise allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 16, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

The outstanding Official Action has rejected Claims 4, 9, 14, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being anticipated by Prust, Burson, Cohen, and Applicant's Background, in further view of Hayes). The Official Action cites Prust, Applicants' Background section, and Burson as disclosing all of the Applicants' claim limitations, with the exception of an icon for driving an automatic upload program. The Official Action cites Hayes as disclosing this more detailed aspect of the Applicants' invention, and states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the cited references for arriving at the Applicants' claims. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As discussed above, neither Prust and/or Burson, either alone or in combination, suggest all of the elements of the Applicants' claims, and Hayes does not remedy the deficiency discussed above. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Therefore, Hayes does not anticipate, or render obvious, the subject matter defined by the present claims when considered alone or in

combination with Prust and/or Burson. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 4, 9, 14, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Consequently, in view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present Application, including Claims 1, 4-6, 9-11, 14-16, and 19-21, is patently distinguished over the prior art, in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Registration No. 40,073
Attorney of Record

Scott A. McKeown
Registration No. 42,866

CUSTOMER NUMBER

22850

Phone: 703-413-3000
Fax: 703-413-2220

BDL:SAM:ycs